

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



February 2012 No 606

VALUES CLARIFICATION

Discrimination ideology comes full circle.

Remember meeting persons of discriminate taste?

Thinking persons discriminate and make statements about their moral/intellectual values.

Australia's media aires personal trivialities ... as if we didn't have worries enough ... perpetual puberty blues for gown-up girls and boys! Here, in the following article, is the harvest of the 60s-70s Revolution when radical feminists sneered at those women who wanted marriage and children, dismissively labelling such women as 'breeders'! Now their offspring are learning a fundamental truth that rationality failed to deliver to them: the quest for life-giving is larger than Talmudic-Marxist-Feminist ideology. Folk wisdom has it that if you make it to 40 without a sexual breakdown, then in old age

you'll be free of some of the specific afflictions that inevitably plague/haunt sexual relationships. During the 1970s-80s teachers' unions propagated anal sex in primary schools with the proviso: "It may hurt at first but you get used to it".

D H Lawrence once, unannounced, called on Gertrude Stein as she was having a 'bitch-fight' with her lover, Alice B Toklas, which smashed the image Stein attempted to disseminate about same-sex relationships among women being more delicate, more meaningful and not as stressful as a heterosexual relationship.

Bolt: I want marriage equality for all

By Stephanie Bolt, Tuesday, 13 December 2011/[69 comments](#)

Last Monday, my brother Andrew Bolt published a column presenting his views in opposition to same-sex marriage.

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/column_once_they_start_at_same_sex_marriage_where_will_they_stop/

I belatedly attempted to post a contribution to the lively blog debate. When it wasn't published, I knew I didn't want to leave it there—being a lesbian in a committed relationship I want to participate in the conversation happening across the country, tell my story and, in doing so, hopefully make even the smallest difference to the long-running campaign for marriage equality. As my family will recall, I came out when I was 21 years old. Like many in the GLBTI community, I was awash with the relief and joy of recognising and expressing such a fundamental part of who I was. Again, like many, I experienced much uncertainty about my value to the community and the fear of rejection.

For the most part though, I feel fortunate to have

received respect and love from people important to me as I made those first tentative steps out of the closet. That, of course, is not everyone's experience. Rejection by parents, siblings and peer groups is not altogether uncommon and low self-esteem, anxiety, depression, substance abuse, and suicide can be the terrible result.

Even with my good fortune, I have felt the effects of ignorance, fear and hate by others: fearing for my life, I was chased down city streets one night by a group of drunk teenagers for holding hands with my girlfriend; I have been verbally abused and taunted about my sexuality when playing sport; and I have felt on social and work occasions the discomfort or disapproval of others upon hearing the word "girlfriend" or "she" in relation to my partner.

Some gays and lesbians view their relationships as equal to those of straight people. But I know of others who would admit to feeling "lesser" or, even if they don't, are fed up with receiving

negative physical, verbal or other signals from the world around them.

Offering civil unions seems a reasonable compromise from the position of any straight person who has not ever had to question for a single moment others' acceptance of their relationship or their right to choose to marry the person they love. Offering civil unions sends a signal that, to me, says I am lesser.

I'm then told that civil unions are in a legal sense similar to marriage and, therefore, why should it not be embraced by same-sex couples? If it's such a palatable alternative it's then fair to ask why it's not embraced by many more heterosexual couples?

To point out the blindingly obvious, many of us regardless of sexuality want to get married; we want the ceremony that is such a significant marker in life's journey. There may be little that legally separates the two, but socially and culturally there's a chasm.

Marriage is touted as one of our most enduring traditions. Traditions are organic; their foundations are laid in the past but they grow and evolve over time. Granting me and my partner the right to marry—to have our loving and committed relationship recognised in law and by the community—doesn't erode that tradition; it builds upon it.

My partner and I celebrate two anniversaries. We first held a "commitment ceremony" at home witnessed by many of our family and friends on a stormy Adelaide spring day. It was the day I told the world I would love my partner forever. It was the best day of my life.

However, it wasn't until we married in the simplest of ceremonies one month later in Canada that I sensed a legitimacy and belonging I wasn't expecting to feel. I think that's because I have built a layer of protection against judgment and negativity for many years around my s-xuality, my relationship and, now, my young son.

It may seem naive, but having that certificate in my hand made me untouchable, secure, normal, and for those wonderful few weeks, I could drop the shield. It's disappointing beyond measure that my brother and others who share his views don't wish that for me and everyone else like me.

I want marriage equality. At the very least, I wish for a rational and respectful debate.

I trust that more thoughtful consideration of this issue will prevail and, whether under this

government or another in the future, my wife and I will finally see our relationship legitimised.

Comments

1. Chris Graham - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 1:15 pm | [Permalink](#)

Fantastic piece Stephanie. You're proof positive that the problem with the Bolts is not one of genetics.

2. SusieQ - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 1:21 pm | [Permalink](#)

Thanks Stephanie. How many more of these intelligent articles are we going to have to read before people get it??

3. David Hand - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 1:23 pm | [Permalink](#)

I've been married twice. The first time was in 1978 in a Baptist Church with all the prayers and blessings etc traditionally bestowed by that corner of the Christian faith on its adherents. The second time was in 2003 on the shore of Pittwater where there were no religeous pomp and ceremony at all.

I think that my second marriage constitutes a civil union but I would like someone with expertise on the issue to comment. I am firmly in favour of same sex civil marriage and as seems necessary, a change to the marriage act to enable this to occur. It's a question of discrimination from my point of view.

4. Sophie Pointer - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 1:23 pm | [Permalink](#)

Fantastic article and amazing that two people who share the same genes have totally different lives! My favorite bit within the article was this sentence: "There may be little that legally separates the two, but socially and culturally there's a chasm". It eloquently captures the heart of the issue. Thank you!

5. Stickey - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 1:35 pm | [Permalink](#)

Another of the long awaited Australian Democrats policies is succeeding.

6. Oscar Jones - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 1:40 pm | [Permalink](#)

I'm white, middle class and heterosexual. The world is my oyster. For anyone else who is not in that narrow range barriers are thrown up and it is a disgrace. Every person is entitled to what others receive. They don't always get it and we should be striving for that equality in every single thing as an ideal. Andrew draws a very long bow when he involves Dr. Philip Nitschke in his argument.

7. John - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 1:42 pm | [Permalink](#)

Well said, Stephanie. Your story is powerful. I hope your brother reflects on it and changes his mind. My brother had no reservations about my de facto husband being his brother-in-law. Unfortunately, my de facto husband's sister has never accepted me as her brother-in-law.

8. Jim Reiher - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 2:13 pm | [Permalink](#)

When I saw that "Bolt" was writing for Crikey, I nearly had a heart attack. But then ... it was Mr Bolt's sister! And what a great piece. I hope it gets more widely circulated. Thanks for sharing your story.

9. Discus - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 2:37 pm | [Permalink](#)

Bob Katter's brother and now Andrew Bolt's sister. Nice work and thank you for letting us into your world.

10. Mike Flanagan - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 2:37 pm | [Permalink](#)

A poignant and moving piece, dripping with honesty Stephanie. As an aged male hetero I have sympathy with your aspirations. However there is one point that hetero's have had that you ignore or overlook and that is the non married partners that have only in recent years gained some legal recognition for themselves and their offspring.

11. Liliwyt - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 2:45 pm | [Permalink](#)

Thank you, Stephanie.

12. Michelle Imison - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 2:47 pm | [Permalink](#)

Onya Stephanie!!

13. Mark from Melbourne - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 2:57 pm | [Permalink](#)

One of my sons is gay and although I thought I was pretty much understanding of the importance of this issue, I learnt something today from this article (which is surely what we are all looking for in this life - a little bit of enlightenment). Thanks for writing it.

14. Wobbly - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 2:58 pm | [Permalink](#)

Well put Stephanie. Best wishes to you. ...at least we can choose our friends!

15. David McRae - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 3:04 pm | [Permalink](#)

Thanks Stepanie "How many more of these intelligent articles are we going to have to read before people get it?" <- What SusieQ said

16. David McRae - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 3:05 pm | [Permalink](#)

Apologies Stephanie on misspelling your name. (I need an edit button and also need to be more careful - sorry)

17. SimsonMc - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 3:15 pm | [Permalink](#)

Thank you Stephanie for sharing your side of the debate, I am richer for the insight. I am and nor should you be surprised that Limited News didn't publish your blog post. Your points are presented with honesty, appear to be well researched and are in good faith. All three criteria that would automatically exclude you from any MSM site controlled by Murdemocracy especially your brother's.

18. Flinthart Dirk - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 3:21 pm | [Permalink](#)

Thoughtful, warm-hearted piece. Here's looking forward

to many more.

19. Vinck Kirsten - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 3:23 pm | [Permalink](#)

Thank God a human Bolt. I wish you all the best Stephanie, I have no idea what archaic argument your brother has put forward as I don't read his articles or else I feel murderous. I am a heterosexual and I think it this day an age it really should be equal on every level for everyone, you and me. Some are saying that Marriage is an old institution and it should stay that way, well it used to be so, so that men could own us women who were mere chattels in the old world. I'm all for progression. And a shrew mask for your brother!!!!!! ha ha ha

20. Jean - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 3:52 pm | [Permalink](#)

Dear lesbian in a committed relationship.

As a lesbian who enjoys a bit of committing with various other lesbians (bi-curious also welcome), may I point out that you represent only one section of a particular sexual orientation/lifestyle choice ... whatever we want to call it. And a very conservative, monogamous, twee section it is ... It's a shame to see gays going so ..., well, straight 😊

21. Warren Joffe - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 3:58 pm | [Permalink](#)

My gay friends don't seem to be much agitated about the issue and neither am I, a heterosexual married male with heterosexual children and grandchildren. That it is not something anyone ought to die in the ditches over is supported to some extent by the absence of even mild demands for this aspect of "equality" or of full human or civil rights 30 years ago when the heavy lifting had been or was being done on removing discrimination, or even much later when more stringent anti-discrimination laws were passed. So....

Not exactly a matter of fashion but capable of being looked at from more than one perspective. What about a different analogy to the one of equal rights, namely that of Trade Marks and weightier claims to Patents and Registered Designs though perhaps Copyright is even better. Marriage belongs to communities who have continued it as part of ancient traditions which make them communities. Is it not insensitive of gays to ask for more than legal support for civil unions and to demand that they be able to upset those who regard the marriage element in their ancient traditions as important and therefore are rationally concerned that confusing their children about the centrality of traditional marriage could result from an act of state which seems to contradict the tradition?

22. Meski - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 3:58 pm | [Permalink](#)

The title with a Bolt byline made me gasp, I must admit. You go, girl!

23. SusieQ - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 4:01 pm | [Permalink](#)

Of course, this article can be looked at in comparison to the news that Kevin Rudd's sister, who has apparently resigned from the Labour Party over their support for gay marriage. She thinks it goes against the teachings of Moses or something - guess she'd be fine about bringing back stonings in the public square and all that other stoneage twaddle?

24. Samuel Windley - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 4:08 pm | [Permalink](#)

Jean's point is an important one. It highlights the discriminatory nature of marriage.

As Stephanie says: "Granting me and my partner the right to marry ... doesn't erode that tradition; it builds upon it." This is precisely the problem. Legalising same-sex marriage would very likely strengthen the institution of marriage. Of course the status quo is severely damaging and unjust, but legalising same-sex marriage would be a step in the wrong direction: we should be moving to abolish marriage entirely.

Marriage idealises a certain type of relationship and denies those with alternative relationship preferences the same sense of "legitimacy and belonging" that Stephanie is so pleased to have obtained. In other words, the origin of that "legitimacy and belonging" is a distinction that marriage (as a pervasive social and legal norm) generates between "married" people and "unmarried" people; a distinction that by definition discriminates against "unmarried" people. This is the same distinction that makes the status quo so horrendous, but legalising same-sex marriage would only make it more likely that marriage's discriminatory and unjust effects will continue.

25. fred p - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 5:02 pm | [Permalink](#)

Great article, Stephanie! Thanks for writing this.

And don't take the non-publication of your comment at Andrew Bolt's blog personally. Every day, his moderators vet the comments contributed and decline to publish many of the ones that are critical of Andrew Bolt. One can only presume this is to deliberately create the misleading impression that most people agree with him. His ego doesn't permit him to listen to what people really think of him.

26. Jim Reiher - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 5:14 pm | [Permalink](#)

There are left of centre Christians advocating for equal rights for gays to marry. (I am one of them.) In the light of that, and also of Jean and Samuels comments above, I find this quote from American (left of centre) Christian, Tony Campolo to be quite insightful:

People say that "marriage is a sacred institution and should be reserved for the union of one man and one woman. If this is the case...I have to ask why the government is involved at all in marrying people? If marriage really is a sacred institution, then why is the government controlling it, in a nation that affirms separation of church and state? Personally, as a Baptist minister, I always feel a bit uneasy at the end of the

weddings I perform when I have to say, 'And now, by the authority given unto me by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I pronounce you husband and wife.' At weddings, after performing a variety of religious exercises, such as reading Scripture, saying prayers, giving a biblically based homily and pronouncing blessings on the marriage, I suddenly shift to being an agent of the state. Doesn't it seem inconsistent that in a highly religious ceremony I should have to turn the church into a place where government business is conducted? ... Allow me to suggest a way out of this conflict and the difficult questions being raised these days about whether our country should approve of homosexual marriages. I propose that the government should get out of the business of marrying people, and instead, only give legal status to civil unions. The government should do this for both gay couples and straight couples, and leave marriage in the hands of the church and other religious entities. That is the way it works in Holland: If a couple want to be united in the eyes of the law, whether gay or straight, they go down to city hall and legally register, securing all the rights and privileges a couple has under Dutch law. Then, if the couple want their relationship blessed – to be married – they go to a church, synagogue or other house of worship. Marriage should be viewed as an institution ordained by God and should be out of the control of the State. Of course, homosexual couples could go to churches that welcome and affirm gay marriage and get their unions blessed there, but isn't that the way it should be in a nation that guarantees people the right to promote religion according to their personal convictions? ..."

He might be onto something here.... In the meantime, if we dont go that way, then Australia should move to allowing gays to marry. It is an equality issue, first and foremost. And for the gays that dont want to... well... that is their choice, but they deserve to have the choice.

27. Dogs breakfast - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 5:15 pm | [Permalink](#)

"To point out the blindingly obvious, many of us regardless of sexuality want to get married; we want the ceremony that is such a significant marker in life's journey." You know, I'm sure you do, but I doubt that applies to your contemporaries.

While you hope for and look for a world where gay's will be able to marry, and I'm good with that by the way, I look forward to a world where inane and outdated concepts such as marriage are long thrown into the dustbin of history.

Most heterosexuals, as far as I can tell, don't make a discrimination in their mind between marriage, civil unions and cohabitation (de-facto) relationships. At the current rate of rise in de-facto and civil unions, within a generation or two perhaps only the gays will be looking for "marriage".

It is in fact you who has taken on board so much of the

malarkey about what marriage signifies, when in fact all that is important about marriage is the relationship that follows, not the damned certificate.

Best wishes with it, but all that you apparently felt about 'marriage' and the legitimacy it magically conferred were all concocted in your own mind. You are no more, or less, legitimate than you ever were.

28. Liz45 - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 5:23 pm | [Permalink](#)

Like others I gasped too - until I read your article Stephanie. What a courageous woman you are. It's a sad indictment on all of us that you have been and probably still are treated with such petty hatred and violence! I'm disgusted but not surprised.

It amuses me that those who promote marriage as god given between opposite sexes deny the stats re marriage and divorce/s? If it's so sacred why are people divorcing? The most ludicrous comment against same sex marriage came from a couple who were going to marry for the third time - both of them had two divorces each! How ridiculous was that?

I'm involved with a women's health centre, and sadly we are all too aware of the discrimination and hatred metered out to wonderful people like you. You have my sympathy and support.

I support same sex marriage(of course) and look forward to an article by you when it finally becomes law - with your son smiling his love and support. Take care Stephanie, you and your partner are not alone! There's lots of support in the community!

ps - I'm still tossing up whether I want to read your brother's article????

29. Johnfromplanetearth - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 5:30 pm | [Permalink](#)

Very well written piece and i agree with it, but beware those can of worms.

30. John64 - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 5:38 pm | [Permalink](#)

History quiz: What happened first?

1. The state's legal recognition of marriage.
2. People getting married in wedding ceremonies.

If you answered 1, you fail - go back to school. Marriage wasn't "legally" recognised (and never actually needed to be legally recognised) by the state for hundreds - if not thousands - of years. Marriage actually pre-dates recorded history.

There's no law that prevents one person getting on bended knee and asking another person of the same sex (or their dog for that matter) to marry them.

There's no law preventing those people, once committed, from sending out invitations to all their friends inviting them to their "wedding" ceremony.

There's no law that prevents the couple from exchanging vows and rings during this ceremony.

There's no law (at least not these days) preventing those people from consummating that marriage on the wedding night.

There's no law preventing those people from living

together.

There's even no law preventing a same sex couple from raising children together (though there are laws around how they might "acquire" those children).

The only law there is, is that it won't be recognised by the state. That's it. All other legal implications of the union can be handled through a Power of Attorney (bank accounts, decisions when it comes to health-care etc...)

Until same sex couples actually start getting married - why /would/ the state recognise it?

Stop asking for the state to give you something like Oliver Twist begging for more gruel.

31. LacqueredStudio - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 5:45 pm | [Permalink](#)

That's long-winded bull, Samuel. Examples, please.

33. Ahmat Melicha - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 5:55 pm | [Permalink](#)

"If it's such a palatable alternative it's then fair to ask why it's not embraced by many more heterosexual couples?"

Great question and such an eloquent writer. I wish you and your wife the best of luck! It's sad that not everyone supports equality but the majority of Australians are with you.

34. Jim Reiher - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 6:00 pm | [Permalink](#)

Liz45 - I agree! I heard a very clever statement recently from a church person who was being honest about the situation: Christians are getting divorced at higher and higher rates than ever before, and yet some of the same people are the loudest advocates saying "marriage is a divine institution". They oppose loving couples who want to marry (gay couples), and they happily divorce! It seems to be only a divine institution until their own marriage goes belly up.

35. McCorkell Graham - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 6:02 pm | [Permalink](#)

A true human story, written with wisdom and logic.

As many have written, the sky has not fallen where marriage equality thrives elsewhere in the world. Thankyou Stephanie for declaring your truth and what it means to come at life through love. This is a story that should attract higher rotation.

36. Ben Hibbs - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 6:24 pm | [Permalink](#)

@Jean - Everyone should have the option, not everyone has to choose it.

37. Frank Quinlan - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 6:36 pm | [Permalink](#)

But Warren, what if that sense of heterosexual ownership of the tradition and institution of marriage that you describe was based on a pre-scientific misunderstanding of the human condition that saw homosexuality as unnatural (at best) and sinful or abhorant (at worst). Now that we understand how flawed this Pre-scientific position was, are we not now obliged to correct our discrimination in order to avoid

really confusing another generation of children about embracing their sexuality with honesty and pride - as Stephanie Bolt seems to have!

38. Daemon - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 6:43 pm | [Permalink](#)

Well done Stephanie. I am thoughtful, having read your article, and the comments by others, about how my relationships, with my wife and my boyfriend would work in terms of recognition. Any thoughts?

39. Buss Peter - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 7:40 pm | [Permalink](#)

Well done Steph. I am Steph's "Father in law"

When Lisa came out many years ago it was not an easy thing to grasp, but at the end of the day, lisa is still our daughter and we love her dearly. Eventually Steph came into our family and it has been fun having her as part of our family unit.

Not to much more to say but hopefully you all get the gist that Steph and Lisa and their son (my grandson) Jasper are much loved by my wife and I. That her brother has such a warped view on life is, in my opinion, his problem. Cheers

40. Samuel Windley - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 9:02 pm | [Permalink](#)

@Lacqueredstudio You really can't work out what types of relationships/sexualities are rendered less-than-ideal by the institution of marriage, especially after Jean (an earlier commenter) already offered herself as an example? To start with, consider all those people who do not conform to the social norms associated with marriage (e.g. "adulterers, prostitutes, divorcees, the promiscuous, single people, unwed parents, those below the age of consent", etc.—quoting from the queer theorist Michael Warner). All these people and their actions are deemed undesirable or abnormal by the institution of marriage. Then there are those who wish to enter into relationships of a type that is excluded from marriage, such as relationships between more than two people, relationships between siblings, relationships between people of the same sex (although perhaps not for much longer), etc. Do you see the discrimination yet?

Warner again: "To a couple that gets married, marriage just looks ennobling ... But stand outside it for a second and you see the implication: if you don't have it, you and your relations are less worthy. Without this corollary effect, marriage would not be able to endow anybody's life with significance. The ennobling and the demeaning go together. Marriage does one only by virtue of the other."

41. Andrew McIntosh – Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 10:36 pm | [Permalink](#)

One would hope the Bolt family get together this Christmas will be alcohol free. I wouldn't mind being there when Andrew explains to Stephanie how not allowing her comment to his article is not censorship - Andrew Bolt loves freedom of speech, you know.

42. Lee Carol - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at

11:40 pm | [Permalink](#)

What a beautiful and insightful article. To me this discussion we are having in our society today should be more about the fundamentals of human rights and whether we have the right to take away those rights from one of our fellow citizens and whether laws passed by a parliament has the right to discriminate because they feel threatened by differences.

Discrimination in all forms is so incidious as to the long term effects on a person way of functioning to render them ineffectual as a human being. The long term effects often have very long term consequences not just for the person at the end of the discrimination but on our society as a whole.

I am so hopeful that the small minority views on people's choices to choose whether they marry or not be it straight or gay are lessening with time. There has been tremendous progress in our society about respecting people decisions and I see this discussion becoming a thing of the past.

I have often asked the question why is it we so want to control people's lives and the decisions they make in their lives especially when those decisions are between the people making them for themselves. What are we afraid of as a society? Why does love draws such derision from sections of our society, really puzzles me. My sister is gay and she is a beautiful soul and a loving person. Does that make her less of a person, absolutely not. I beg my fellow citizens love one another and respect each other's choices and we will be surely a better society for it.

God Bless you Stephanie Bolt, your wife and your son.

43. Chuck D - Posted Tuesday, 13 December 2011 at 11:53 pm | [Permalink](#)

Marriage and civil unions are both indicators of bias towards specific relationship styles. Bias is fine, we're allowed to prefer things, but don't get all high and mighty about 'equality' or the like. If you want to argue for improving the institution (i.e allowing gays the right to marry) then at least make clear why this would be useful or fair but a full extension of flexibility in contract (polygamy, for instance?), or the removal of the whole shebang, would not be fairer.

44. Warren Joffe - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 1:26 am | [Permalink](#)

@ Frank Quinlan - My answer is that your hypothesis is contrary to fact. Marriage was instituted presumably to firm up the arrangements for acknowledging parenthood and bringing up children with all sorts of variations of detail owing to extreme patriarchy, occasional matriarchy, and so on. The Greeks lack of distaste for homosexuality suggests that the idea that homosexuals might contemplate marriage or that anyone would think of providing them with the same legal attachments as heterosexuals would have produced, as first reaction, a scratching of the head and simple puzzlement. "Why would anyone want to do that?" would have been the reaction.

45. Frank Quinlan - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 7:47 am | [Permalink](#)

@ Warren - That your argument for maintaining the status quo rests on a "presumed" interpretation of an ancient, pre-scientific culture, illustrates my point.

46. Peter Ormonde - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 9:43 am | [Permalink](#)

Lovely piece. Bob Katter, now the Blot.... They're everywhere this lot... even in the best families.

Slowly we are beginning to realise that this is not an issue about Them - it is an issue about Us - and how we live, what we think is a fair go, what we think Government has a role in doing and where it should bugger off.

And now we have Tony Abbott trying to lock his colleagues into not exercising their conscience vote ... a divine right according to the mythology. Watch this space. Sometimes the Australian public are a fascinating bunch to watch.

47. John - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 10:03 am | [Permalink](#)

@Buss Peter - Yours was a very special and wonderful contribution. Thank you.

48. Mord - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 10:14 am | [Permalink](#)

Wait, so Bolt wouldn't even publish the comments from his own sister on his blog? Some bad blood running through that family or just an oversight? Judging from the tone of both of your writings i'd say it's the former...

49. Barnes Michael - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 10:15 am | [Permalink](#)

Ms Bolt, your bring a well reasoned, logical argument. You'll never get a career in the media with that sort of attitude. I have no doubt one day same sex marriages will be accorded the same rights, privileges and responsibilities as heterosexual marriages are currently afforded. Its a disgrace that it has to take so long.

50. Warren Joffe - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 11:23 am | [Permalink](#)

@ Frank Quinlan - I suppose you are right in saying my contributions are an "argument for maintaining the status quo". Logically correct. My purpose was, however, that of the deep sceptic who would like gays to question their current enthusiasm for being able to say that a whole lot of largely heterosexual legislators, largely uninterested in the issue but deeply committed to re-election by tuning in to whatever vote-changing minorities are passionate about, have enshrined gay unions in the law as "marriage". Might it not pass like such other trivial enthusiasms as changing the flag or changing the relationship of the Queen to Australia (bypassing her idiot son(s) might be something with a bit more flesh on it)?

As in reading an Agatha Christie novel one should perhaps ask "where's the money?" the deep sceptic in me suggests. As a recipient of a public sector pension I am deeply appreciative of the fact that, if I survive my spouse, my children or grandchildren can marry me

(legally or de facto) to a strong young lad from the Third World who will act as male nurse, driver and wood chopper in return for a substantial super-indexed pension when I die which he can receive for 60 years.

51. Archer - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 11:26 am | [Permalink](#)

As I had already written on another thread, and was backed up by Mal O' Canberra, Andrew Bolt may be many things but he is not homophobic. And this illustrates why. I would suggest he did not want his sisters article posted on his blog so that family was kept out of open forum. Would you protect family from some of the more abusive contributors? Or would you allow them thrown to the wolves. You all seem to have a preconceived idea that Bolt readers are feral. If she were my sister I wouldn't have allowed it. Congratulations on a well written article Stephanie.

52. Warren Joffe - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 11:27 am | [Permalink](#)

@ Frank Quinlan and John64 - Applause for John64! (I trust that is birth year: makes you old enough to be sensible. Or should I be looking to compare it with, say, Leviticus 97:1 which may well contain a rousing condemnation of those who use unauthorised orifices?)

53. LacqueredStudio - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 12:54 pm | [Permalink](#)

@Samuel Windley: we should be moving to abolish marriage entirely How?

Put the theory books down, step outside for five minutes and grab a lungful of reality. Then explain to me a) why the straight majority would voluntarily relinquish their right to marry, and b) why the ascendent same-sex marriage movement would abandon its momentum.

It's not going to happen anytime in the foreseeable future, is it? Unless you propose abolition by force ...? This is still a democracy, Sam.

So with the idea of abolishing marriage left safely beyond the realms of reality, it remains for advocates of marriage rights for polyamorous and incestuous relationships to argue the merits of their case. Trouble is, both arrangements are fraught with obvious complexity. Polygamy and polyandry raise serious legal hurdles regarding consent and equality, and how do you ensure the rights and wellbeing of children when we know incest greatly increases the likelihood of birth defects?

Gay marriage raises no such hurdles – it's still a binding commitment between two consenting adults. All that changes is the gender exclusivity of the partners involved. And right now, gay marriage is on the threshold of achieving law reform because there's an organised, popular campaign pushing for it, supported by a majority of the public.

There is no such organised movement, with popular support, calling for incest and poly relationships to be granted marriage rights. But if there ever is, then it will stand or fall on its merits. Just like gay marriage has.

To argue that marriage should be *abolished* solely on the grounds it discriminates against other relationships with *serious* legal and ethical complexities ... places you, and perhaps Michael Warner, firmly on the bench next to Stan ('Loretta') of the People's Front of Judea, arguing against biology for his theoretical right to have babies.

But that's why cultural studies is so great—a world of theory and conjecture, completely untethered by practicality or likelihood.

54. Harry Rogers - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 1:20 pm | [Permalink](#)

Im starting to believe Australia is full of bleeding hearts. What a terrible life we all have. My attention and sympathy go to children stuck in hospital with leukaemia, teenagers with disabilities and the list goes on. Why is so much space devoted to such specious undeserving attention. Get a life people and look around you at the real people who deserve help.

55. davidk - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 1:52 pm | [Permalink](#)

Something I never expected to say: "I agree with Bolt on this." Oh the shock

56. Liz45 - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 2:24 pm | [Permalink](#)

@DAVIDK - Which Bolt and why?

57. Sancho - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 2:37 pm | [Permalink](#)

Why is so much space devoted to such specious undeserving attention.

Get a life people and look around you at the real people who deserve help.

And therein lies the tragedy. Legislating gay marriage is extremely easy and will have no effect but to remove many people from second-class citizenship and bring Australia into the 21st century.

It's a no-brainer of social policy that should have occurred a long time ago, but a selfish minority that doesn't want to give up archaic prejudices is prolonging an absurd debate which the next generation of conservatives will disown, based on - no joke - Leviticus.

58. Peter Ormonde - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 3:47 pm | [Permalink](#)

Harry, Yes kids with cancer and disabilities wrack the heart. And I'm, sure that, if there was a law prohibiting kids with leukemia or physical disability from marrying someone they loved then you would be champing at the bit to get the Government to change the law and get out of the bedroom.

This is not an either/or issue here Harry. We can care about a lot of things. The quality of mercy is not strained as some smooth-talking bugger once splottered.

Some things can be fixed easily - man made problems and silly old and outmoded laws. Some things are a bit trickier - like MS, cancer and the other catastrophes this god entity apparently visits on us with mens rea.

That doesn't mean we don't fix those things we can and should.

Frankly Harry I can't think of why any sane person would want to enter into such an arrangement. But it's none of my business really why people do such foolish things.

When will the Government make some sort of bike helmet compulsory for those peddling around riding on hope and trust?

59. bluepoppy - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 3:56 pm | [Permalink](#)

Great article Stephanie. My daughter is a lesbian and as a parent my hopes for her are the same as for my hetero daughter, that she find happiness in a loving relationship but most of all acceptance from a still very polarised community.

It is interesting that many Conservatives on this issue sprout liberal and libertarian ideas including around freedom of speech except when it comes to an issue they do not support.

Perhaps we are all a little blind in this context, but there is no sound reason why same sex couples should not have access to the 'marriage' should they so desire.

60. Harry Rogers - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 4:41 pm | [Permalink](#)

Actually I think there is two selfish minorities! The selfish religious based communitywhich has always wanted things THEIR way and the droning on and on of the terribly hard done by(?) homosexual community which appear to be only interested in their life and their hardships.

If we devoted all the funds that governments give to homosexual and religiuos communities to the real world problems of those who can't defend or look after themselves, then perhaps we may be moving to a just society instead money and effort going to the loudest talkers on pathetic self interested debates.

61. Samuel Windley - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 4:45 pm | [Permalink](#)

@Lacqueredstudio - explain to me a) why the straight majority would voluntarilly relinquish their right to marry"

The psychological pathways that drive populations to change their political views are extremely complex. On the one hand, social psychologists and sociologists of social movements could describe plenty of mechanisms, derived from empirical data that explain how a majority of Australians could come to understand the way in which marriage discriminates (and consequently see marriage as undesirable). On the other hand, they could also describe mechanisms that explain how a majority of Australians might be prevented from reaching this understanding. The bottom line, then, is that most people who study this stuff for a living would concede that we do not yet have a sufficient understanding of social psychology to definitively conclude that a majority of the Australian population is incapable of appreciating marriage's discriminatory

essence in the foreseeable future, and b) why the ascendent same-sex marriage movement would abandon its momentum

See above. There are many social movements that have lost their momentum, and for many different reasons. Questions about the sociology of social movements and social change are rarely as simple as: "there's a popular movement supporting a particular reform, so that reform is inevitable". People get distracted, co-opted, intimidated, etc. The history of social change makes me very wary of anyone who makes claims of "inevitability". Unless you propose abolition by force ...?

I can't even begin to imagine how marriage, a sociolegal construct, could possibly be abolished "by force". The only way to abolish marriage is to make use of the same phenomenon that brought it into being: discourse.

As for the ethical issues you identified with certain types of relationships, I share your concerns. I note that you chose to discuss the most "controversial" of the categories of people against whom marriage discriminates (e.g. I'd be interested to hear your defence of the harmful social effects marriage has on unwed parents, or on single people who pursue a promiscuous lifestyle), but that doesn't make the ethical concerns you identified any less important.

Whether those ethical concerns provide sufficient justification for the establishment and maintenance of an institution along the lines of "marriage", however, is exactly the kind of question that I am arguing we should be discussing, since it explicitly recognises that marriage doesn't *only* discriminate against people who want to marry someone of the same sex. What concerns me much more than the abolition or otherwise of marriage is the way in which most of the left-liberal discourse on same-sex marriage renders all these *other* discriminated-against people invisible.

62. S Winston - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 5:37 pm | [Permalink](#)

I made a succinct comment a few hours ago, but it does NOT appear here. Has it been censored because it was not supportive of Ms Bolt's philosophy?

63. Mark out West - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 6:45 pm | [Permalink](#)

This story proves that BOLT is a real life boy in a bubble, only himself to keep company and insulted from the world's beautiful diversity.

63. Edward James - Posted Wednesday, 14 December 2011 at 8:35 pm | [Permalink](#)

We the peoples either accept the law or the lord. Whatever that may be, is up to those two people wanting to be married. Married is a matter of law not lord. Over a hundred years ago someone made a distinction between the Church and State. I point out the Church was put before then State. Now the people need to make themselves heard! Edward James

64. FadeAolani - Posted Thursday, 15 December 2011

at 12:20 am | [Permalink](#)

Stephanie, I am so sorry that your brother is so unsupportive. My own brother was the first person I turned to, the first one I came out to, and he was the embodiment of reassurance and understanding. Andrew would do well to take a leaf from a good brother's book.

65. LacqueredStudio - Posted Thursday, 15 December 2011 at 1:30 am | [Permalink](#)

@Samuel Windley: So in other words: academics will eventually 'discourse' the rest of us into abandoning the institution of marriage, one tiresome essay at a time. Meanwhile ...

It wasn't so many years ago that I was thoroughly enjoying my own queer, polyamorous lifestyle. Met heaps of lovely, gorgeous people. Had an absolute ball. But never did I meet a single person who gave a *damn* about recognition and approval from mainstream society. Indeed, the *whole point* of being "single and promiscuous" was the exact opposite.

But let's look at your Michael Warner's other dispossessed: "adulterers, prostitutes, divorcees ... unwed parents, those below the age of consent".

How the age of consent can be construed as discrimination wrought by the institution of marriage defies me. But please, go your hardest. Adulterers? Well, adultery is fundamentally a transgression of honesty and trust. Defend that if you possibly can, otherwise, where consent is involved, you're talking about polyamory (see above). Prostitutes? In our post-modern world, mainstream secular society generally no longer gives a shit about sex out of wedlock. Rather, prostitution attracts its stigma because it's sex for *cash*, which is a whole other story completely divorced from marriage.

Which brings us neatly to divorcees and unwed parents. These remnants of your disenfranchised underclass aren't maligned by the institution of marriage. They're maligned by institutionalised bigotry. I know, because I'm one of a broad 'mainstream' of married citizens ... who manages to accept and support alternative relationships *at the same time*. If marriage were ultimately to blame for those people feeling ostracised in some way, people like me would be few and far between.

We're still essentially a pluralistic society, with its fabric woven ground-up from the fibre of day to day relationships. If you and Michael Warner really think the existence of marriage is a tyranny that robs the unwed of free agency and self worth, I'd suggest you've both been reading too much Foucault.

Try De Certeau instead; he just lives his life exactly as he pleases.

66. Samuel Windley - Posted Thursday, 15 December 2011 at 10:40 am | [Permalink](#)

Come on Lacqueredstudio, we both know there's no such thing as reading *too much* Foucault. 😊

All I can say is that you are making many assumptions

(about whether the existence of marriage affects people's conceptions of themselves, for example) that are either unsupported or undermined by decades of social psychological research. If you really believe that the existence of marriage does not shape your view of "alternative relationships" or "sex out of wedlock", then I'm not sure what I can do to convince you other than to recommend that you pick up a decent social psychology textbook. (Can't you see how simply knowing about and using the phrase "sex out of wedlock", for example, has normative consequences?) I've got no problems with a discussion about whether the normative consequences of marriage are good or bad (although obviously I think they're probably pretty bad), but if you're going to deny that marriage *has* normative consequences (i.e. that it shapes people's conception of what is normal and what is good), I doubt that I can convince you otherwise in this forum.

67.Archer - Posted Thursday, 15 December 2011 at 11:51 am | [Permalink](#)

Sancho Wednesday, 14 December 2011

Why is so much space devoted to such specious undeserving attention. Get a life people and look around you at the real people who deserve help.

"It's a no-brainer of social policy that should have occurred a long time ago, but a selfish minority that doesn't want to give up archaic prejudices is prolonging an absurd debate which the next generation of conservatives will disown, based on - no joke - Leviticus."

1/ There is a defining difference. The no brainer is no person wishes a human being physical harm. I don't want to see children in hospital. It's cut and dry.

Gay marriage is a social issue, as you point out, needing social policy and reform. The very fact that there are such diametrically opposed opinions shows that it's not a matter of recalcitrance, ignorance or stubbornness but a matter of conscience and personal belief.

2/ Trying to build your argument by disrepecting or mocking a persons religious or moral beliefs isn't going to get you any closer to any resolution.

FYI-I'm neither religious nor against gay marriage, but respect a persons right to have their say.

68. LacqueredStudio - Posted Thursday, 15 December 2011 at 1:56 pm | [Permalink](#)

I agree that marriage has normative consequences. My argument is that a) bigoted arseholes are largely to blame for any harm that may follow, not the whole institution. And b) the normative influence of marriage has been on the wane for some decades.

In my rich existence thus far, when it comes down to it on a face-to-face level, I've found society to be generally accommodating of diversity and deviation. But maybe I'm not talking to enough wankers.

69. Liz45 - Posted Thursday, 15 December 2011 at 5:08 pm | [Permalink](#)

Just a thought to those who believe that there are more

important things to discuss! Well, when it's all boiled down, we're all different, with different lives, aspirations, life experiences etc, what's important to one is not even thought about by the next person. Let's not decide that same sex marriage shouldn't take up space in our deliberations just because gays and lesbians etc are a minority? People with special needs are a minority; kids with cancer are too(thankfully) kids who are blind, and older people without transport are another. They're all important because they effect peoples' daily lives and happiness etc.

People with work related pain and disability are also a minority - does that mean we get rid of Health & Safety Laws etc in the workplace? Of course not! We're a very small country with lots of riches to share, including riches of the heart and soul! That's important to all of us!

@BLUEPOPPY - Of course you do love them both, but sadly, not all parents are like you. I'd love mine regardless, and now I have the same feeling for my grandchildren. I love them unconditionally, like you. Your daughter made a good choice when she chose you to be her Mum!

I've often wondered myself at the hypocrisy of too many, who rave on about freedom, democracy ad nauseum - the rights of the individual (like the Libs assert?) but then? when it comes to anything to do with sex? double standards! I'd accept that if they followed through on other avenues of life - such as them not being rich while others go without etc, but, again, along comes the hypocrisy. Drives me nuts!

Abbott is a good case in point. Rants on about free speech. Went in to bat for A Bolt (over his racist articles?) etc, but won't allow his colleagues a conscience vote? What happened to his ideals of freedom of the individual blah blah? Drives me batty! Truly!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: John Kaminski

<pseudoskylax@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Jan 20, 2012 at 9:56 AM

Subject: Re: My attitude to homosexuals

To: Darkmoon <darkmoon@darkmoon.me>

Cc: Dan Kahraman

<dan.kahraman@sympatico.ca>

Lasha Darkmoon! Hmm, pseudonym. Epidemiologists' pseudonym rule: automatically assign a probability of 49 percent that the writer is Jewish, and observe carefully the writer's footnoted references to calculate a percentage of Jewish sources. Then do the math.

Lasha, OMG. Good thing you didn't publish this! . . . if you are who you pretend to be. The Skylax University Jew-o-meter has suddenly registered you with a score of 83 in the likely to be a Jew pretending not to be one category.

I'm beginning to smell a serious but disappointing rat in this whole enterprise.

Point 1. There is a ton of evidence PROVING that male gay behavior is caused by lack of testosterone at a certain critical juncture in the fetus, which I reported but inadvertently and seriously underemphasized.

Point 2. I am not homophobic. I react to any sexual offer from gays as I would a physical assault, and react in the same way, decisively and definitively. It is the PROMOTION of gay behavior that is my principal cause of alarm, not the actual behavior, because it has been proven genetically that it is normal behavior for those in this genetic position. My objection to the PROMOTION of it is that it is a physical health hazard and a serious psychological danger to the victims of homosexual predators. All homosexuals are not predators.

Point 3. Scientific American is an utterly Jewish magazine that twists science into something unrecognizable and perverse. It is about as reliable scientifically as Popular Mechanics, which carried the famous Chertoff version of 9/11.

Point 4. For Dan Kahraman to even mention, never mind use as sources, the infamous names of Christopher Story (a New Age composite like Sorcha Faal who still sends me emails of a syrupy and vapid nature), Tim White or Stew Webb (both of whom are well known covert Jewish provocateurs, CIA false opposition types using false names like Eli James; I went through all this crap with them seven years ago, Tom Heneghan, Tom Flocco, Rosalee Grable, the list is long).

Point 5. Dan Kahraman tried to proselytize me several years ago that Satan is the real god didn't upset me as much as it would have most other people because I happened to know that Satan was the deity of the civilization before what we know as the beginning of civilization that colonized the whole world, so it was natural for the opposers of that race of giants to declare the enemy's god evil. Unfortunately it was the good god, and Yahweh was the bad one, which is why we have followed the trail of his blood down through time. So I could have engaged in a discussion with him of these facts, but his superficial and propagandistic presentation of his grasp of it scared me off as a ploy in the Jewish destabilization template technique.

Point 6. Several years later Dan was back on my mailing list, having first wormed his way through the emails of my friend Bruce, which always get 100 percent credibility rating. So, I thought, hmm, maybe I should take a second look to be sure of my conclusions.

Point 7. He immediately starts luring us into Hawks Cafe, the notorious 9/11 false opposition site about as authentic as Leuren Moret and Alfred Lambremont Weber's rapt narration of standard government UFO holographic phenomena over Jerusalem and the re-arrival of God, or something like that.

Point 8. Then he adds he is gay. The moment he told me that it made me realize that all gays are trapped under the spell of the Jewish perversion thing. Act Up is a Communist organization, so are all the other gay groups. Sorry, more math to do. Multiply it all by the Jewish destabilization template.

Point 9. Pseudonym Darkmoon writes what I came very close to calling "the story of the year" until this discussion started. Key to her story was a debate with famous and florid (which means probably gay) ex-Jew Israel Shamir, in which another suspect entity, one Carolyn Yeager, came up with the beautiful and so-true line (paraphrasing) a Jew can never really be anything but a Jew. Thank you, Carolyn, that really turned on a light in my head. Your interview with Bruce was a real embarrassment, BTW. I got seven emails thanking me for interrupting you, more than I have ever received for any radio appearance.

Too many points, and there are more. But let's cut to the chase. The Jew-o-meter is palpitating.

Dan Kahraman has earned a permanent expulsion from my mailing list, no appeal heeded. Hawks Cafe is just another dead end distraction meant to keep you from talking about how Jews did 9/11.

Lasha, you've been caught out in the Jewish spotlight, which has serious implications for Occidental Observer (which includes several secret Jews using non Jewish pseudonyms) and Reason Radio (home of the notoriously and suspiciously ineffective Mark Weber), both of which are now publicly charged with being Jewish counterintuitive false opposition initiatives similar to Henry Makow, Brother Nathanael, and so many boring and cloying others.

As I know a thing or two about French symbolist poetry, I couldn't help but notice that your translation of one of Baudelaire's poems was about the joy of blowjobs. Very Jewish, Lasha.

You're pushing 90 on the Jew-o-meter. As I've always wanted to meet a woman conversant in French poetry, I sincerely hope you can lie your way out of this one.

Best wishes,

John Kaminski - <http://johnkaminski.info/>

PS to David in Ohio and Paul in Oregon. No, I'm not removing you from my mailing list, because I know you both love me and I've hurt you very much. You also know I return that love — just not in that way — and what I've told you is the truth, and you know it, so get over it, be who you are, always remembering that love is trying to do no harm and always telling the truth.

PPS: Innumerable FYI BCCs on this.

On Fri, Jan 20, 2012 at 5:04 AM, Darkmoon <darkmoon@darkmoon.me> wrote:

"We will get along very well Lasha, even if we don't agree..."

I have nothing against gays as people. My own male cousin is gay and we get on fine, though we never refer

to his sex life. That is a taboo subject. I just think that what gays do is wrong. I don't believe people are born gay, but that they are made gay and choose to go down that path. Here is a quote from a recent (unpublished) article of mine:

"Research designed to prove that gays and lesbians are "born that way" has come up empty — there is no scientific evidence that being gay or lesbian is genetically determined."

[See:<http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/homosexuality/h0075.html> based on John Horgan, "Gay Genes, Revisited," *Scientific American*, p. 26, November 1995.]

The article I've written was the result of recent researches done after reading John Kaminski's recent essay "The Gay Plague". I told John I was writing it and asked his permission to quote from it. To which he kindly agreed. However, I doubt he will give me his permission to publish this article. His permission is necessary because I told him I would need his permission.

You would be pleased with what I have written. You will almost certainly be repelled by it and regard it as extremely homophobic. For this reason, if no other, I feel I must abandon the idea of publication. It's a pretty long essay: over 6000 words. It covers a lot of ground. But it's going to get me hated if it's published. Intensely hated. I'm hated badly enough at present. I've been advised by my sister to scrap the whole idea and concentrate on non-sexual subject matter. "Write about politics," she advises me. "Stop going on about sex all the time, or people will think you have sex on the brain."

Anyway, Dan, nice talking to you. The human mind baffles me, even my own mind. It baffles me that I should write such a homophobic essay and yet feel friendly towards you. I must have a split personality.

Sincere best wishes,

Lasha

The gay plague Insight into destructive forces determining the way we think

By John Kaminski

pseudoskylax@gmail.com

<http://johnkaminski.info/>

Homosexuals are not normal human beings in the same way that Jews are not normal citizens of any country in which they reside.

Public acceptance of homosexuality has been used by the Jewish puppetmasters to destabilize societies they are plundering.

All societies coalesce on the basis of protection of one's own children and property. Homosexuals and Jews sabotage this life-sustaining coalescence as they are

motivated by their own pathological and physiologically deviant propensities.

The original, official acceptance of homosexuality in contemporary society occurred in 1973 after three-year long jihad of outrageous public insults to American psychiatrists by an ad hoc army of gay activists.

To get the aggressive homosexuals to stop harassing them, the American Psychiatric Association canvassed its 10,000 members and by a vote declared that the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-II (DSM-II)* would no longer classify homosexuality as a pathology. Instead, it would be called an alternative lifestyle.

No medical evidence whatsoever figured in this decision.

Coming on the heels of ten turbulent years of the totally Jewish Women's Liberation Movement, which exacerbated the deterioration of the American nuclear family, this gay pronouncement further loosened what religious types might call the bounds of decency, and boldly pushed homosexuality into the public limelight as something that deserved our tolerance and compassion.

On an interpersonal level, this attitude is desirable, because love and understanding are the most important things in life.

But what are we trying to understand? A physiological and psychological perversion. It is not an alternative lifestyle, it is the physiological consequence of testosterone deficiency during early pregnancy that produces effeminate males.

<http://news.softpedia.com/news/Low-In-Utero-Testosterone-Levels-Determine-Homosexual-Behavior-in-Males-52005.shtml>

The real question is why those effeminate males produce such a flamboyantly depraved culture, and the simple answer is that is because homosexuality is depraved, unnatural and irresponsible to the highest degree.

It is probably the most potent weapon in the arsenal of the Jewish destabilization template, which has now destroyed most of the countries it has touched (and that's all of them).

On a sociological level, the attempt to pretend homosexuals are normal has resulted in just what homosexual behavior always produces:

- Unwanted sexual attacks on children and adults.
- Accelerated deterioration of the nuclear family.
- Skewing of discussions about anything because of having to recognize the gay perspective (which is strikingly like the Jewish perspective), and . . .
- Utter unreliability and untrustworthiness in any institution, organization, or business that employs gays, whose behavior, either in concealment or extravagant flaunting of their chosen attitude, always destabilizes any relationship with any member of the heterosexual majority.

The answer you get when you protest these things is

always "we must tolerate others who are different." The response to that should always be "I have no wish to recognize an obvious illness, a sickening deviation from normal behavior, as normal, because (1) it disgusts me, and (2) it is extraordinarily unhealthy and destructive behavior."

Thus does a small percentage of psychological and physiological aberrants force the vast majority of ordinary heterosexuals to tolerate something that disgusts them, verifying Nietzsche's observation that the Jewish philosophy promotes disease and depravity as virtues, something we observe in today's slanted media almost every day.

How this whole pro-gay agenda has metastasized into the sewer of destructive social engineering now dominating mainstream society — with transgender sex advocates prominent on our Supreme Court and closet homosexuals selected as U.S. presidents, senators, judges and generals so they can be more effectively controlled by their beastmasters at suburban East Coast synagogues — is the focus of our story tonight. You must know by now that for a decade or more, poison Jewish rules from the American Federation of Teachers have brought condoms into elementary schools and homosexual advocates talking to first graders about how great queer folk really are.

The heterosexuals of America have cringed in horror at this blatant disregard and destruction of most people's moral values, as well as the minds of children who are forced to receive these perverted messages.

Since people's first sexual experience almost always becomes a sexual preference throughout life, millions of healthy lives have been ruined by inserting this information into the mind of child too young to grasp its implications, or molesting him or her at any age.

The conflict and chaos, both inner and outer, that results from this profound psychological intrusion illustrates a classic example of Frederic Bastiat's concept of having to choose between morality and the law.

Parents have lost their right to teach their children about life, because our anti-human government has declared we must be nice to homosexuals, and accept their warped behavior no matter how much it makes us want to hurl. Or no matter how many children it hurts. The American people have pretty much gone along with this twisted policy, and reaped the noxious consequences of it, principally the destruction of the American family, which had already suffered greatly as a result of the Women's Liberation Movement.

Because we kept silent, these attacks on our natural rights as human beings have increased in both number and profundity. The protestations of religious types were drowned out by a combination of preachers getting busted with hookers of both genders, or Jewish-generated liberal Protestant denominations ordaining gay priests into their roles as societal saboteurs.

What got the big headlines was the Catholic priests with

their hands down boys' pants, although the Jews milked that for all it was worth (almost as much as the Holocaust reparations scams, but that's another story). The aspect of this story never told is the covert effort to get gay Jews into Catholic seminaries.

These laws demanding we accept sexual aberrations as normal, based on false data that have prostituted our children and profaned our lives, are nothing we ever wanted or approved; they are the degenerate plan of master race advocates to morph us into passive automatons, barely conscious, responding only to the commands of our supervisors.

As Freud's master manipulations gave us a society ruled by pill pushing Jewish dissemblers forcing us to eat the feces of their own nihilistic projections, so Jewish controlled Washington has dispensed an endless array of drugs, weapons and mental constrictions on a populace that mostly has never cared about who is taking how much off the top as long as they have their sedatives and distractions secure and nearby.

Mental constructions, media creations, Rumsfeldian productions that allege some terrible thing about someone else, mention that it is our goal to protect these people, then kill large numbers of them, and the American people, at least through what the media tell us, cheer this behavior. If this is you, please step in front of a speeding bus now.

Tyrants never give up their power voluntarily. It's up to those who resist to figure out the components of the tyranny, and dismantle them.

The born gay hoax

<http://www.freewebs.com/theborngayhoax/theapa.htm>

Prior to December 14, 1973, the American Psychiatric Association (APA) considered same-sex attraction a disorder. The disorder was listed in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-II (DSM-II)* under the label, "Homosexuality." Psychiatry's authoritative voice influenced public opinion, which at the time was negative toward both sodomy and the types of people who engaged in such acts. Although public sexual activity in parks and public restrooms contributed to societies negative views, "scientific opinion" was crucial in the public attitude.

In an effort to remove "Homosexuality" from the *DSM* pro-sodomy activists began a program of intimidation aimed at the American Psychiatric Association circa 1970. Activist Franklin Kameny states the movement's objective clearly, "I feel that the entire homophile movement...is going to stand or fall upon the question of whether or not homosexuality is a sickness, and upon our taking a firm stand on it..."[\[1\]](#) Franklin Kameny led the Washington D.C. chapter of the Mattachine Society during the 1960's. In the tradition of Magnus Hirschfeld and Alfred Kinsey, Kameny viewed one's attraction to a specific gender as fluid, and viewed sodomy as morally equivalent to natural sexuality. Led by radicals like Franklin Kameny, pro-sodomy activists attacked psychiatrists across America,

as Newsweek describes:

"But even more than the government, it is the psychiatrists who have experienced the full rage of the homosexual activists. Over the past two years, gay-lib organizations have repeatedly disrupted medical meetings, and three months ago—in the movements most aggressive demonstration so far—a group of 30 militants broke into a meeting of the American Psychiatric Association in Washington, where they turned the staid proceedings into near chaos for twenty minutes. 'We are here to denounce your authority to call us sick or mentally disordered,' shouted the group's leader, Dr. Franklin Kameny, while the 2,000 shocked psychiatrists looked on in disbelief. 'For us, as homosexuals, your profession is the enemy incarnate. We demand that psychiatrists treat us as human beings, not as patients to be cured!'"[\[2\]](#)

Ironically, at the very moment Franklin Kameny was claiming that sodomy was healthy, safe, and natural a deadly virus was silently passing through communities of men all over the nation. Only a decade later, thousands of men would be dead or dying of AIDS.

Homosexual Activists Intimidate American Psychiatric Association into Removing Homosexuality from List of Disorders

Dishonesty and intimidation had won the day for the same-gender sex movement, and when activists publicly claim that this vote was a scientific decision; they hide three years of deceit and intimidation.

<http://conservativecolloquium.wordpress.com/2007/10/01/homosexual-activists-intimidate-american-psychiatric-association-into-removing-homosexuality-from-list-of-disorders/>

It's very interesting that during the past four decades mainstream media have shined a bright light on the heterosexual trysts of famous politicians and celebrities, from Monica Lewinsky to John Edwards. But the homosexual entanglements of presidents draw nary a raised eyebrow as they are kept secret by media moguls who only reveal secrets that suit them.

Could be that most of the Jewish media moguls, like a significant number of famous politicians, are really closet homos.

In addition to his famous gay bathhouse membership with "friend" and "adviser" and now Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel, Obama has a string of dead friends (in addition to Larry Sinclair, who also was recently murdered) all alleged to be his sexual partners in his younger days.

<http://politicalvelcraft.org/2011/11/03/breaking-mother-of-murdered-obamas-gay-partner-speaks-up-1-of-the-3-homosexual-members-of-obamas-trinity-church-murdered/>

The gay proclivities of former President George W. Bush have been well documented if totally suppressed by the mainstream, but his famous overnight visits from body building homosexual ex-Marine Jeff Gannon testify to his preference.

http://www.newsfollowup.com/ledeen_8.htm#gannon

http://www.newsfollowup.com/ledeen_8.htm#Abramoff

Even recently in the news was former president Richard Nixon's allegedly gay relationship with Miami raconteur Bebe Rebozo back in the 1960s and '70s.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article2078822/Did-Nixon-gay-affair-Mafia-fixer-Forget-Watergate-A-new-book-claims-Americas-corrupt-Presidenthidfarpersonal-scandal-.html#ixzz1hheLH5or>

Then throw in the secret Skull & Bones initiation at Yale that compromises initiates with filmed homo behavior as a blackmail tool that guarantees their sticking with the program of the predators who are plundering the world.

<http://mindprod.com/politics/bushbooksskullandbones.html>

Combine all these things with the Israeli worldwide sex slavery ring, stealing white girls from impoverished Slavic countries and putting them in brothels around the world; the demonic Talmudic suggestions that it is OK to have sex with children; and the societal push over the course of my lifetime to saturate the world's media with sexual images in order to sell things, and you have a vast substrate of sexual perversion that undermines societies everywhere in the world.

The fabled Jewish fact manipulator Henry Makow, so popular on the false opposition websites for his ability to claim that good Jews are forever being victimized by bad Jews, recently postulated the disinfo theorem that "all pornography is gay", following the policy of the Sanhedrin and the Protocols of Zion to destabilize the heterosexual population.

As usual, Makow, best known for his insistence that the Balfour Declaration that started World War I was a Christian idea and plot, deliberately got it backwards. The real lesson is this. **All homosexuality is pornography. And all pornography — this is a well known fact — is Jewish.**

This will tell you why the behavior of homosexuals and Jews is so similar. Which leads us to the the real point, and a solution to the problem — because it is a problem, and a big one — of homosexuality in the world.

It is not homosexuality that is the real problem; it is the sex addiction. **Basing a monogamous heterosexual relationship on sex is well known to be a failed emotional strategy that inevitably leads to disillusionment and/or disaster.** Yet it is this chimera that all homosexual relationships are based upon — guaranteeing either failure or hypocrisy. So-called individual freedom advocates down through time have all castigated the repressive dictatorship all religions have insisted upon regarding sexual matters. But what too few residents of this planet have ever understood is that this so-called tyranny in the regulation of sexual relationship by the church was essential to the creation of relatively stable societies.

And we see clearly today that the abandonment of these principles has led to a miscegenative nightmare

in a society generally considered to be disintegrating on all levels at this time.

Thus, the real problem is not males who like males, or females who like females, but people who use sex as a drug instead of a sacrament, people for whom sex is an escape from their chosen daily torment rather than a sublime bonding with your best friend, and bridge to the universal vibe that watches out for our welfare every second we know it's there.

The one thing I hope you remember from this story is that homosexuality gained its mainstream approval on the basis of nasty public pressure from an insistent group of flaming faggots, without a shred of medical evidence to back up their claims.

Now we have a White House full of homosexual "czars" ready to wreak their Jewish-taught pathological vengeance on innocent people who have done them no harm. Since first sexual experiences tend to remain the preference for life, how many otherwise healthy lives (because homosexuality is simply not healthy for anyone) have been ruined — with our government's enthusiastic approval? Did you ever notice that the one significant word that does not appear in the Talmud is love?

Personally, sex without love is something I'd rather not have. But society, pretty much run completely by Jewish pornographers, has taught generations of humans that getting off is more important than getting home.

Beyond the gay problem is a larger dilemma, one the Jews have exploited to destabilize societies everywhere. This is the real gay plague, and it's not limited to homosexuals.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HrByVdX_ZXI

Read the lyrics so you can better understand and remember what the real problem is.

JONI MITCHELL:

SEX KILLS

I pulled up behind a Cadillac;
We were waiting for the light;
And I took a look at his license plate-
It said, "Just Ice."
Is justice just ice?
Governed by greed and lust?
Just the strong doing what they can
And the weak suffering what they must?
And the gas leaks
And the oil spills
And sex sells everything
And sex kills ...
Sex kills ...

Doctors' pills give you brand new ills
And the bills bury you like an avalanche
And lawyers haven't been this popular
Since Robespierre slaughtered half of France!

And Indian chiefs with their old beliefs know

The balance is undone-crazy ions-

You can feel it out in traffic;

Everyone hates everyone!

And the gas leaks

And the oil spills

And sex sells everything

And sex kills ...

Sex kills ...

All these jackoffs at the offs at the office

The rapist in the pool

Oh and the tragedies in the nurseries-

Little kids packin' guns to school

The ulcerated ozone

These tumors of the skin-

This hostile sun beating down on

This massive mess we're in!

And the gas leaks

And the oil spills

And sex sells everything

And sex kills ...

Sex kills ...

Sex kills ...

Sex kills ...

Who would have guessed, so very long ago, that sex, drugs and rock-n-roll would be a key part of the formula for our permanent sleep?

John Kaminski is a writer who lives on the Gulf Coast of Florida, constantly trying to figure out why we are destroying ourselves, and pinpointing a corrupt belief system as the engine of our demise. Solely dependent on contributions from readers, please support his work by mail: 250 N. McCall Rd. #2, Englewood FL 34223 USA. <http://johnkaminski.info/>

Australia





ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

December 2011

The Ulrich von Hutten Award

*

I meant to do what I dared to do and I still do not regret it.

Even though I may gain nothing from it, my honesty must be plain in what I believe.

Upon reflection, you must serve the commonweal and not one man alone,

Even though they call me a priest-hater I will let them lie and say what they like.

If I had concealed the truth, I should have many admirers.

Now I have spoken out and have been banished for it.

Though I shall flee no further I appeal to all honest men, and I may return.



1488-1523

German Knight and Freedom Fighter

Presented to

Dagmar Brenne

- for her belief in the goodness of the German people,
and in her unwavering belief in Jesus Christ and Adolf Hitler,
thereby uniting the Cross and the Swastika.